

POTRERO POWER PLANT UNIT 7 PROJECT
00-AFC-4
NOVEMBER 20, 2000
DATA REQUEST, SET 1
WORKSHOP SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Energy Commission's staff project manager for the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Project siting case, Marc Pryor, opened the workshop at 2:00 p.m. at the Potrero Hill Neighborhood House, in San Francisco, California. Mr. Pryor explained that the purpose of the workshop was to discuss the issues related to cultural resources, air quality, biological resources, soil and water resources, visual resources, power plant reliability and efficiency, noise, geology and paleontology and transmission system engineering. Due to project conflicts Mr. Pryor represented staff in the technical area of soil and water resources. A list of participants is attached to this summary.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Energy Commission: Mr. Gary Reinoehl

DATA REQUEST NO.30

The applicant expressed concern about the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and the request to identify historic resources on adjacent properties. In addition, the applicant requested clarification of the APE.

Mr. Reinoehl stated that the APE includes the plant site, the discharge and intake facilities, the linears and an area around those aspects of the project. He also stated the definition of an APE, or an impact area, is expansive under the laws that apply to cultural resources. Some aspects of integrity (e.g., feeling, setting, and association) can be altered when properties are adjacent to or some distance from the project. An APE should not be defined in a restrictive manner.

The applicant asked if they had to provide a State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Form 523 for all the properties along the natural gas supply pipeline route (a linear facility).

Mr. Reinoehl referred the applicant to Data Request No. 32, which indicated that staff wants a characterization of the buildings along the linear with some indication of their ages, so that if some unforeseen effect occurred, staff would have some information about the properties.

The applicant expressed concern that this might involve a large number of buildings, in particular, the Union Iron Works is a major concern.

Mr. Reinoehl asked if the most recent portion of the buildings was over 45 or 50 years of age. The applicant responded that it is. Mr. Reinoehl said that he could not give the applicant a specific answer at this time without knowing something more about the properties. He suggested that holding a conference call after the applicant completes some of its research may be a way to resolve how much work would be required. The applicant agreed that they would call for more clarification if it is needed.

AIR QUALITY

Energy Commission: Mr. Tuan Ngo

DATA REQUEST 1, A-D (STEAM INJECTION AND THE DRY LOW-NOX COMBUSTORS):

The applicant will provide copies of the assurances they got from both GE and Westinghouse relating to steam injection. However, since the applicant told us that this injection will occur in the compressor and not the combustors this is less of a concern.

DATA REQUEST 2 (INTERPOLLUTANT OFFSET RATIO):

The applicant will review the material (primarily La Paloma) available to them and determine if they will defend a different ratio (1.1 to 1.0).

DATA REQUEST 3-7 (STARTUP INFORMATION):

The analysis assumes that all start-ups are cold and the applicant is willing to accept the cold startup emissions for all startup classifications.

DATA REQUEST 8 (INFORMATION ON THE CERTIFICATION NUMBERS FOR THE EMISSION REDUCTION CREDITS):

The applicant has stated that these numbers are in the confidential filing. Staff will verify.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Energy Commission: Mr. Michael Clayton

OVERVIEW

Consultants for the Applicant requested clarification on several Visual Resources Data Requests and presented their suggested approach to several others. A number of new photographs from new and revised KOPs were also presented. Clarifications, modifications, and agreements arrived at for specific Data Requests are presented below. Staff assumes that the Applicant has no further questions regarding First Round Data Requests not addressed at the November 20 Workshop. In some cases the Applicant's consultants indicated that they would not be able to meet the December 5 deadline for submittal of responses to First Round Data Requests.

DISCUSSION OF DATA REQUESTS

ALL PHOTOGRAPHS AND SIMULATIONS

Staff reiterated the need for life-size images to be presented in the Applicant's documentation. The Applicant's consultants agreed to provide appropriately scaled images and a discussion of their scaling methodology.

DATA REQUEST 47

Item (a) of Data Request 47 is restated to request quantified estimates of the expected reasonable worst case (occurring 10% of the time) and average (occurring 50% of the time) plume height and width. Data is to be provided for daytime and nighttime under no fog conditions.

DATA REQUEST 48

Applicant will provide the information requested in Data Request 48 in order to clarify the project's sphere of influence. This information may be combined with other figures to be presented in the Visual Resources Section (see Data Request 59 below) and will also include a narrative discussion.

DATA REQUEST 49

The Applicant has established a new KOP as requested in this Data Request.

DATA REQUEST 50

The Applicant has revised the location for KOP 4 as requested in this Data Request.

DATA REQUEST 51

Due to the difficulty of obtaining a less obstructed view of the project site from the Bernal Heights area, staff has agreed to accept either the slightly revised location illustrated in Attachment 4 to this Data Request or the Applicant's originally submitted KOP 4 location.

DATA REQUEST 55

The Applicant has established three new KOPs as requested in this Data Request. Based on a review of the Applicant's setting photograph for the new South of Market KOP, staff has agreed that a simulation from that location will not be necessary due to the substantial viewing distance. Only the existing view photograph will be required as well as a complete KOP discussion equivalent to the other KOP discussions. A simulation of the project site will be provided for the other two new KOPs including San Francisco Bay and Pacific Bell Park (which captures a similar though considerably closer view compared to the South of Market high rise view).

DATA REQUEST 57

The cross-reference to Data Request 16 should actually refer to Data Request 55.

DATA REQUEST 59

The Applicant will provide the information requested in this Data Request. The information may be combined with the sphere of influence information discussed above under Data Request 48.

DATA REQUEST 72

The cross-reference to Data Request 16 should actually refer to Data Request 49.

DATA REQUEST 73

The cross-reference to Data Request 16 should actually refer to Data Request 49. Also, the simulation of nighttime lighting (with no plume) requested in this Data Request will only be required if the simulation of night lighting and plume visibility requested in Data Request 74 reveals a major plume effect.

DATA REQUEST 74

The cross-reference to Data Request 16 should actually refer to Data Request 49. Also, the simulation requested in this Data Request will be provided by the Applicant.

DATA REQUEST 75

The windrose data requested in this Data Request has been provided in AFC Appendix F (Quarterly Windroses from 1992).

DATA REQUEST 79

The cross-reference to Data Request 16 should actually refer to Data Request 49. A decision on the need for the simulation requested in this Data Request (typical plume with dimensions occurring 50% of daylight no-fog hours) will be based on plume visibility modeling results since the plume may not be substantially visible). The reasonable worst case plume (occurring 10% of daylight no-fog hours) will be simulated under Data Request 80.

DATA REQUEST 80

The cross-reference to Data Request 16 should actually refer to Data Request 49. The simulation requested in this Data Request will be provided by the Applicant.

DATA REQUEST 92

The simulation of the VIS-6 tree plantings requested in this Data Request will be provided by the Applicant but will be submitted after the December 5 deadline for submittal of responses to First Round Data Requests, pending consultations with staff of the City and County of San Francisco and neighborhood groups as appropriate. The view location will be selected once the planting design is finished and may or may not include KOP 3.

DATA REQUEST 93

The simulation of the VIS-6 tree plantings requested in this Data Request will be provided by the Applicant but will be submitted after the December 5 deadline for

submittal of responses to First Round Data Requests, pending consultations with staff of the City and County of San Francisco and neighborhood groups as appropriate. The view location will be selected once the planting design is finished and may or may not include KOP 3.

DATA REQUEST 95

The cross-reference to Data Request 16 should actually refer to Data Request 49. The simulation of the VIS-7 design treatment requested in this Data Request will be provided by the Applicant but will be submitted after the December 5 deadline for submittal of responses to First Round Data Requests, pending consultations with staff of the City and County of San Francisco and neighborhood groups as appropriate.

DATA REQUEST 96

The simulation of the VIS-7 design treatment requested in this Data Request will be provided by the Applicant but will be submitted after the December 5 deadline for submittal of responses to First Round Data Requests, pending consultations with staff of the City and County of San Francisco and neighborhood groups as appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Please see the attached comment by Mr. Joe Boss, a member of both the San Francisco Potrero Task Force and the Dogpatch/Potrero Hill Boosters, that proposes an additional KOP. (Attachment A.)

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Energy Commission: Dr. Noel Davis

OVERVIEW

Discussion related to aquatic biological resource data requests focused on the Draft Survey Protocol for Collection and Analysis of Validating Data and my comments on the Draft Survey Protocol. Issues discussed during the main workshop are summarized below.

Tenera raised the point that the comments seem to be shifting the emphasis away from validating previous data. I explained that for the benthic study the purpose of the survey is to characterize what is there now not compare to older data. The proposed survey protocol will do that although some stations may be moved to better represent the new facilities instead of previous surveys. Because a one-time survey is proposed, data do not need to be validated against previous data to proceed with the analysis for the PSA. The fish survey will compare results both to the 1989/90 study and to recent data from CDFG Station 109. If new data at the proposed outfall indicate the fish community is similar to either or both of the other data sets, the PSA can proceed on schedule. Thus, this shift in emphasis is only an issue for the 316 (b) assessment. The problem is that they did not sample the source water in the older surveys so the shift in emphasis of basing the analysis on

the source water populations presents a problem. Comparisons with the older data may not be applicable, and three months worth of data is not sufficient to characterize the source water that may be affected by the new intake. Further discussions need to be held to resolve this issue.

MIDWATER TRAWLS

Dr. Davis requested midwater trawls to sample water column fishes in her comments on the Draft Survey Protocol. Tenera said that it is very difficult to do midwater trawls in such shallow water. They thought that because the water was so shallow, the otter trawl would collect water column fishes. We agreed that we do not want gill net sampling because of the damage to the fishes. Tenera said they would try to do midwater trawls. I said I hoped that they could at least complete enough trawls to demonstrate that the otter trawl was collecting the midwater species.

CLAM STUDY

Tenera said that the clam study requested by Mike Foster as part of the 316(b) assessment might be difficult because the Morro Bay study may not commence for quite some time. A clam study using the DNA methods proposed for Morro Bay is probably only practical for Potrero if it can be done in conjunction with the Morro Bay study. Tenera pointed out that clams are much less of an issue for central San Francisco Bay than they are for Morro Bay.

BREAK-OUT MEETING

Following the discussion of biological resource data requests in the public meeting, a separate break-out meeting was held in a smaller room to discuss further the survey protocol. This break-out meeting included Dave Mayer and Carol Raifsnider of Tenera, Becky Ota of the California Department of Fish and Game, Brian Mulvey of the National Marine Fisheries Service, and Arleen Navarret of the City of San Francisco. Various other people dropped in for parts of the discussion.

CONCERNS VOICED BY BECKY OTA OF CDFG

Becky Ota mentioned that Mike Rugg had not been coordinating with her. Therefore CEC needs to make sure that she gets copies of all communications. Becky listed several of her concerns that need to be addressed in the analysis. She will send a written copy. Her concerns included:

1. Potential cumulative impacts of Potrero Unit 7 and Hunters Point.
2. The effects of resuspension of contaminants in the sediments. These sediments may be resuspended both by construction and by the new outfall.
3. The thermal effects of the discharge on the development of herring eggs and cumulative impacts on herring.
4. The potential for the intake and outfall to disperse the larvae of exotic species.
5. Any potential for contaminants in Islais Creek to get into the aquatic environment. Directional drilling under Islais Creek will require a Streambed Alteration Agreement under Section 1603 of the California Fish and Game Code.
6. Making sure that 100% mortality was assumed for entrained larvae.

7. Potential impacts of keeping the long outfall pipe and cooling water system clean.

BENTHIC AND FISH SURVEYS

Considerable discussion related to the location of stations for both the benthic survey and the fish survey. It was agreed that Tenera should relocate stations to sample better the potential impact areas rather than the location of previous surveys.

SEDIMENT CONTAMINATION

The presence of contaminants in the sediments is a major issue both from the viewpoint of health effects to subsistence fisherman and potential effects to fishes. The project must propose a way to avoid contaminating the aquatic environment during project construction.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Please see the attached comments by Ms. Ena Aguirre, a resident of the area. Her comments address: water and sewage, and the potential for closure of the Hunters Point Power Plant if the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Project is constructed and operated. (Attachment B.)

**POTRERO POWER PLANT UNIT 7 PROJECT
NOVEMBER 20, 2000
DATA REQUESTS, SET 1, WORKSHOP
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Marc Pryor
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, M.S.-15
Sacramento, CA 95814

Monica Schwebs
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mark Harrer
Southern Company
1350 Treat Bl., Ste. 500
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dale D. Shileikis, et al
Dames & Moore
221 Main St., Ste. 600
San Francisco, CA 94105-1917

Noel Davis, Ph.D.
Chambers Group
17671 Cowan Av., Ste. 100
Irvine, CA 92614

Ena Aguirre
1414 Newcomb Av.
San Francisco, CA 94124

Michael Clayton
Michael Clayton & Assoc.
503 Nevada St.
Sausalito, CA 94965

Joe Boss
Dogpatch/Potrero Hill Boosters
934 Minnesota
San Francisco, CA 94107-3012

Gary Reinoehl
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, M.S.-40
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tuan Ngo
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, M.S.-14
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mr. Di Capo
Livingston & Mattesich
1201 K St., Ste. 1100
Sacramento, CA 95814

James Browne
ELJC/SAEJ
536 Mission St.
San Francisco, CA 94104

Dave Meyer
Tenera Energy
1 Market 180 Spear Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105

Carol Raifsnider
Tenera Energy
1 Market 180 Spear Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105

Becky Ota
CDFG
411 Burgess Dr.
Menlo Park, CA 94025